

REMARKS

Claims 12-22 remain pending in this application. Claims 12-22 are rejected. Claims 1-11 are previously cancelled. Claims 12-15 and 17 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to express the invention in alternative wording, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

The specification is amended to more closely reflect the subject matter of the Korean specification, and as supported by the figures of the application. No new matter is added.

Claim 12 (and claims 13-16, 18 and 19) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Diaz et al. (US 6,908,452). Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*" *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference is deficient with regard to the following.

Claim 12 recites in pertinent part the following:

an outer casing including an upper case and a lower case;

a tubular body having opposed ends connected with one another;

a projecting holder being disposed centrally of an interior of said outer casing and extending axially between said upper and lower cases, about which said tubular body is circumferentially wound to form at least two layers of said tubular body;

a branch conduit connectably joining said opposed ends of said tubular body to one another, said branch conduit including an injection port for injection of medical fluids, said injection port being exposed to an outside of said upper case; and

a hose for delivery of the medical fluids extending through said outer casing and connecting to said branch conduit within said outer casing

As such, claim 12 includes a recitation, in accordance with which, the tubular body is circumferentially wound about the projecting holder disposed centrally of the interior of the outer casing and which extends axially between upper and lower cases,

to form at least two layers of the tubular body around the projecting holder. In stark contrast, the cited Diaz et al. reference teaches the provision of a single layered reservoir 24, as depicted, for example, in Fig. 2A.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 (and claims 13-16, 18 and 19 dependent therefrom) each particularly describes and distinctly claims at least one element not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claim 12 (and claims 13-16, 18 and 19) and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 17 is rejected as obvious over Diaz et al. in view of Davis (US 3,217,949) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that the proffered combination of references cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the secondary Davis reference, which is offered only for its teaching relating to an openable and closeable lid, does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection that is absent from the primary Diaz et al. reference. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claim 17 and its allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 20-22 are rejected as obvious over Diaz et al. in view of Lee (US 6,024,724) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the proffered combination of references cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the secondary Lee reference, offered only for its teaching relating to the interactive arrangement of the branch conduit and the affixing member, does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection that is absent from the primary Diaz et al. reference. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 20-22 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests a two (2) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$225 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg by
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicant

and,

By Lawrence I. Wechsler
Lawrence I. Wechsler
Reg. No. 36,049
Attorney for Applicant

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340